IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE G. BIKSHAPATHY

And

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE P.S.NARAYANA

-

WRIT PETITION NO.12348 of 2004

AND

WRIT PETITION NO : 12349 of 2004

WRIT PETITION NO.12348 of 2004

Between:

1 V. Narayana Swamy Reddy, S/o. Late Thippa Reddy,
Inspector of Police, Kurnool Range, Kurnool District.
2 A. Ramachandra, S/o. A.P. Dastagirappa,
Inspector of Police, C.I.D. Hyderabad.
3 D. Ramanjaneyulu, S/o. Venkataramana,
Inspector of Police, Anantapur.
4 B. Narasappa, S/o. B. Lakshmaiah,
Inspector of Police, C.I.D. Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 J. Srinivasulu, S/o. J.V. Chelamaiah,
Inspector of Police, Tirumala, Chittoor District.
2 B.R. Srinivasulu, S/o. B.R. Obulesu,
Inspector of Police, Kadapa.
3 C. Bhaskar Reddy, S/o. Subba Reddy,
Inspector of Police, Faction Zone, Kurnool Range

4 S. Madhubushan, Inspector of Police,
Kondapuram Circle, Kadapa District.
5 K.V. Raghava Reddy, S/o. Venkata Reddy,
Inspector of Police, A.P. Transco, Kurnool.
6 M. Siva Rami Reddy, S/o. Late M. Subramanyam Reddy,
Inspector of Police, Hindupur 1 Town, Anantapru District.
7 Ch. Ravi Kumar, S/o. Late Ch. George,
Inspector of Police, Dharmavaram (Rural), Anantapur.
8 M. Lakshmi Naidu, S/o. M. Narayanappa,
Inspector of Police, ACB, Anantapur Range, Anantapur.
9 The Director General and Inspector General of Police, Hyderabad.
10 The Government of A.P. Rep by its Secretary, Home Department,
Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
11 The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Kurnool Range, Kurnool.
12 The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Hyderabad Range, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of CERTIRIORI and to call for records relating to and connected with order of Hon'ble Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal dated14-5-2004 passed in OA No. 2928 of 2004 and batch and quash or set aside the same and to further direct the official respondents to maintain the cadre strength of Sub-Inspectors of 1989 batch within the sanctioned strength with all consequential benefits.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.P.NAVEEN RAO

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.9 to 12: GP FOR SERVICES I

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 3 to 8: Mr.MANOHAR REDDY MALLASANI.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: None appeared.

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

–

–

–

–

WRIT PETITION NO : 12349 of 2004

Between:

1 V.Narayana Swamy Reddy S/o. Late Thippa Reddy,
Inspector of Police, Kurnool Range, Kurnool District.
2 A. Ramachandra S/o. A.P. Dastagirappa,
Inspector of Police, C.I.D, Hyderabad.
3 D. Ramanjaneyulu S/.o. Venkataramana
Inspector of Police, Anantapur.
4 B. Narasappa S/o. B. Lakshmaiah
Inspector of Police, C.I.D. Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1 B. Laxminarayana S/o. Somaiah, Inspector of Police,
O/o. Director General of Police, Hyderabad.
2 Ch. Laxmipathi, S/o. Suryanarayana, Sub-Inspector of Police,
Through the O/o. Director General of Police, Hyderabad.
3 S. Babu Rao S/o. Raju, Sub-Inspector of Police,
Through the O/o. Director General of Police, Hyderabad.
4 N. Vijaya Prasad, S/o. Asiraiah, Sub-Inspector of Police,
Through the O/o. Director General of Police, Hyderabad.
5 T. Sarkar S/o. T. Abdul Rahman, Inspector of Police,
Madanapalli Rural Circle, Chittoor District.
6 K. Rajendra Prasad, S/o. Sreeramulu, Inspector of Police,
Government Railway Police, Secunderabad.
7 P. Ramakrishnaiah S/o. Narayanaswamy, Circle Inspector of
Police, Atmakur Circle, Kurnool District.
8 D. Amarnatha Naidu, S/o. Venunatha Naidu, Circle Inspector
of Police, Kurnool Range , Kurnool District.
9 T.S. Venkataramana, S/o. Chetti, Circle Inspector of Police,
Kadiri Rural, Anantapur District.
10 K. Eswar Reddy S/o. Eeshwar Reddy, Circle Inspector of Police,
Nagari Circle, Chittoor District.
11 P.Venkatanath Reddy S/o. Subba Reddy, Circle Inspector of
Police, Panyam Circle, Kurnool District.
12 L.K.Krishnan, S/o. Subban,. Assistant Vigilance and
Security Officer, T.T.D. Tirupati, Chittoor District.
13 P.N. Babu S/o. Naganna, Circle Inspector of Police,
Nandikotkur, Kurnool District.
14 S.K. Chandra Sekhar S/o. Malleshappa, Sub-Inspector of Police,

Through the O/o. Director General of Police, Hyderabad.
15 G. Ramanjaneylu, S/o. Subba Rao, Sub-Inspector of Police,
Through the O/o. Director General of Police, Hyderabad.
16 Shaik Lal Ahmed S/o. Shaik Fareed, Sub-Inspector of Police,
Through the O/o. Director General of Police, Hyderabad.
17 D. Gangadharam S/o. Veeraiah, Sub-Inspector of Police,
Through the O/o. Director General of Police, Hyderabad.
18 The Government of A.P., represented by its Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
19 The Director General and Inspector General of Police, A.P., Saifabad, Hyderabad.
20 The Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Certiorari and to call for records relating to and connected with judgment of Hon'ble A.P. Administrative Tribunal dt. 20.11.2001 rendered in OA No. 6915 of 1994 and quash or set aside the same and also declare the government Memo No. 42833/Police-C1/2001-1, Home (Police-C) Dept. and 11.3.2002 and the Head of the Department orders in C.O. Memo NO. 855/E1/2002 dt. 18.6.2002 as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional and violative of provisions of A.P., Public Employment (Organization of local cadres and regulation of direct recruitment) order 1975 and to further direct the official respondents to regulate the cadre of Sub-Inspectors in Zone-IV within the sanctioned cadre strength for the 1989 batch with all consequential benefits.

Counsel for the Petitioners: MR.P.NAVEEN RAO

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.18 to 20: GP FOR SERVICES-I

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.5 to 12 and 14: MR.NOOTY RAM MOHAN RAO.

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.13, 15 to 17: None appeared.

The Court made the following:

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

–

COMMON ORDER: (per PSN.J.)

V.Narayana Swamy Reddy and others filed Writ Petition No.12348 of 2004 questioning the interim order dated 5.5.2004 as extended by order dated 14.5.2004 passed by A.P. Administrative Tribunal (for short Tribunal) in O.A.Nos.2928 of 2004 and batch. The said writ petitioners also filed Writ Petition No.12349 of 2004 praying for a Writ of Certiorari to call for records relating to and connected with judgment of the Tribunal dated 20.11.2001 rendered in OA.No.6915 of 1994 and quash or set aside the same and also declare the Government Memo No.42833/Police-C1/2001-1, Home (Police-C) Department, dated 11.3.2002 and the Head of the Department orders in C.O.Memo No.855/E1/2002 dated 18.6.2002 as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional and violative of provisions of Andhra Pradesh Public Employment (Organisation of local cadres and regulation of direct recruitment) Order, 1975 and to further direct the official respondents to regulate the cadre of Sub-Inspectors in Zone-IV within the sanctioned cadre strength for the year 1989 batch with all consequential benefits and pass such other suitable orders.

2. Official respondents in both the Writ Petitions are common. The unofficial respondents, no doubt, are different, but, however, the questions involved in both the Writ Petitions being common, both these Writ Petitions are being disposed of by a common order.

3. The Writ Petitioners stated that the Andhra Pradesh State Level Police Recruitment Board conducted selections for the recruitment of Sub-Inspectors of Police in the year 1988 and the selections were held and against 55 vacancies available in Zone-IV, selections and appointments were made. All the 55 vacancies available in the year 1988-89 were filled up by 1989 batch Sub-Inspectors. It is further stated that after the 1989 batch, 1991 batch was recruited and they are immediate juniors to 1989 batch. As the Sub-Inspectors of 1989 batch have already stood promoted as Inspectors of Police, it is now the turn of 1991 batch of Sub-Inspectors for promotion as Inspectors. In fact some of the 1991 batch Sub-Inspectors have already been promoted as

Inspectors. It is also further stated that there is an *inter se* dispute among the 1989 batch Sub-Inspectors. Some of the Sub-Inspectors appointed and allotted to Hyderabad City Police desired to come to Zone-IV in view of better avenues of promotion. At the instance of such Sub-Inspectors who were originally appointed and selected to Hyderabad City Police but desired to come to Zone-IV, the Sub-Inspectors working in Zone-IV were replaced and vice versa postings were issued. It is further stated that aggrieved by the orders of transfer from various zones, including Zone-IV to Hyderabad City Police, O.A.No.6915 of 1994 was filed before the Tribunal contending that the orders of the Government contained in G.O.Ms.No.288, Home (Police) Department, dated 6.5.1986 and their transfer from Zone-IV to Hyderabad City Police is illegal and violative of the Presidential Order. It is further stated that those applicants impleaded none of the affected parties. It is also stated that the Tribunal by its judgment dated 20.11.2001 allowed the OA holding that the transfer of applicants to Hyderabad City Police is illegal and it was also held that unit of appointment is respective zones and persons appointed in one zone cannot be transferred to any other zone or Hyderabad City on permanent basis. It was further declared that the persons appointed in Zone-IV are entitled to retain their seniority in Zone-IV. It is further stated that the Government in Memo No.42833/Police-C1/2001-1, Home (Police-C) Department, dated 11.3.2002 issued instructions to implement the orders of the Tribunal and the Head of the Department issued consequential orders in C.O.Memo No.855/E1/2002, dated 18.6.2002. It is further stated that on account of posting of some of the applicants in OA.No.6915 of 1994 in Zone-IV without replacing any other person, the sanctioned strength for the year 1988-89 recruitment has exceeded by 16 persons and all the 32 persons were shown above the 1991 batch of the Sub-Inspectors of Zone-IV, thereby affecting their right for promotion and advancement in service. It is further stated that the applicants in the said OA had been transferred and posted to Hyderabad City Police in pursuant to direction issued by the Tribunal in R.P.Nos.4622, 4640 and 9453 of 1989 dated 16.6.1989, they cannot seek to come back to Zone-IV. At any rate applicants cannot be posted to Zone-IV as long as the persons transferred and posted in their place are retained in Zone-IV. It is further stated that in accordance with the directions of the Tribunal, as stated above, simultaneously equal number of Sub-Inspectors were posted to Zone-IV in the place of

applicants in OA.No.6915 of1994. In the absence of their orders of appointment in Zone-IV is questioned and without impleading them, no relief for retention in Zone-IV could be claimed by the applicants therein. It is further stated that the Tribunal had erred in allowing the OA and directing posting of the applicants in the said OA in Zone-IV with seniority without deciding the issue of legality and validity of posting of 16 Sub-Inspectors of Hyderabad City Police in the place of applicants and the impact against such posting vis-a-vis the Presidential Order or on the Sub-Inspectors of zone-IV. It is further stated that the Tribunal failed to appreciate that if the applicants in OA.No.6915 of 1994 were posted in Zone-IV with seniority, it would greatly enhance the existing strength beyond the sanctioned cadre strength. As against 55 vacancies available for 1988 recruitment, on account of judgment of the Tribunal the strength was increased to 71, which is contrary to the provisions of the Presidential Order and settled principles of law. It is also further stated that the Tribunal failed to appreciate that on account of posting of 16 Sub-Inspectors additionally in Zone-IV, the conditions of service of 1991 Sub-Inspectors belonging to Zone-IV are directly affected. It is needless to say that these petitioners were not impleaded as parties in the aforesaid OA. It is further stated that once the Sub-Inspectors were allotted, regulation of conditions of service should be within their unit of appointment. There is no such provision in the Presidential Order for re-allotment of candidates from one unit of appointment to another unit of appointment once they stood allotted to a particular unit. It is also further stated that in view of the allotment made, there is a threat of reversion and in such circumstances having come to know about the effect or impact of the interim order, which had been impugned in Writ Petition No.12348 of 2004 and the final order, which had been passed in OA.No.6915 of 1994 with M.A.No.2098 of 2001, had been questioned.

4. It is needless to say that the writ petitioners are not parties to the aforesaid OA. Hence, claiming leave of the Court as they are affected parties, the present Writ Petitions are filed praying the reliefs specified supra.

5. At the outset it may be appropriate to look at the impugned order made in OA.No.6915 of 1994 with M.A.No.2098 of 2001, dated 20.11.2001 which reads hereunder:

“All these present applicants are working as Sub-Inspectors of Police in Hyderabad City Police having been drawn from different zones namely I, II, III and IV. They filed this application praying to declare the action of the respondents in getting and continuing them in Hyderabad City Police from the other units of appointment as illegal and violative of Presidential Order and further they sought for a declaration that GO.Ms.No.288, Home (Police) Department, dated 6.5.1986 as illegal and arbitrary and consequently they sought for a direction to re-allot them to their respective zones with all consequential benefits.

It is not in dispute that the applicants are born in different zones. It is also not in dispute that the zone is a local area and the unit of appointment for the post of Sub-Inspector of Police. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the applicants that contra to sub-para 3 of the Presidential Order, the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.288, dated 6.5.1986. It is also the submission of the learned counsel for the applicants that the applicants are entitled for their seniority to be maintained in their respective zones. Contra to the Presidential Order, the applicants were transferred to the Hyderabad City Police. The action of the respondents is questioned earlier in several other O.As., when similarly situated persons to that of the applicants were transferred from different zones to Hyderabad City Police. In the said O.As., this Tribunal held that such persons who are born in different zones, zone is the unit for the post of Sub-Inspector of Police and thus, transferring them from native zone to Hyderabad City Police is not in accordance with the Presidential Order. Consequent on such findings of this Tribunal in various O.As., the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.349, Home (Police-C) Department, dated 15.12.1997. Para 5 of the said G.O. reads that ‘the Government after careful examination of the entire matter direct that the transfers of Police Personnel from one local cadre to another local cadre be permitted only for a limited period without conferring any right to seniority in the local cadre which the individual is transferred even though the said transfer is on administrative grounds’. The learned counsel for the applicants thus submits that the O.A. may be disposed of with a direction to the respondents to re-transfer the applicants to their respective zones as per G.O.Ms.No.349 dated 15.12.1997.

In the facts and circumstances of the case present herein and considering the submissions made by both the parties, the respondents are thus directed to maintain seniority of the applicants in their original units of appointment in accordance with the terms and conditions of G.O.Ms.No.349, dated 15.12.1997. The O.A. is allowed accordingly with the above directions. M.A.

also stands allowed".

6. Mr.E.Manohar, learned Senior Counsel representing the writ petitioners would contend that the Sub-Inspector post is a zonal post and while disposing of O.A.No.6915 of 1994, G.O.Ms.No.288, dated 6.5.1986 and G.O.Ms.No.349, dated 15.12.1997 have been considered. But, however, the historical background of this litigation and the impact of the allotment order dated 17.7.1989, by virtue of which the allotment had been made, had not been considered and therefore the same had attained finality. The learned counsel had pointed out that the cadre strength cannot be increased and moreover the affected parties were not impleaded in O.A.No.6915 of 1994. The learned counsel would also point out that it is not a case of transfer simplicitor and just by questioning G.O.Ms.No.288, dated 6.5.1986, no relief can be granted inasmuch as the proceedings dated 17.7.1989 had attained finality and without questioning the same and without considering the effect or impact of the said proceedings, the OA could not have been allowed. The learned counsel had also pointed out several other aspects relating to the merits of the matter.

7. Mr.J.R.Manohar Rao contended that for the last 15 years these persons are working in Zone-IV. He would also point out that Writ Petition No.12348 of 2004 was filed only against an interim order and no doubt Writ Petition No.12349 of 2004 was filed as against the final order made in OA.No.6915 of 1994 as aforesaid.

8. The learned Government Pleader for Services-I would contend that these Writ Petitions were filed after obtaining leave of the Court. He, no doubt, would submit that the proceedings dated 17.7.1989 had not been considered and several other aspects relating to the historical background of the litigation commencing from 1989 onwards had not been brought to the notice of the Tribunal and the Government also had not brought to the notice of the Tribunal all these aspects and hence the impugned order in Writ Petition No.12349 of 2004 was passed without appreciating the relevant aspects.

9. Mr.Nooti Ram Mohan Rao, on the contrary, would contend that the respondents in the Writ Petitions were meritorious candidates and whether the allotment order dated 17.7.1989 had been considered or not is immaterial for the reason that the original appointments as can be seen from the Memo dated

19.12.1988 produced before this Court would show that these appointments were made on the ground that they are the meritorious candidates. He would further submit that these persons being the meritorious candidates, alteration of the cadre strength would not in any way alter the situation and therefore the impugned order cannot be found fault with. The learned counsel would point out that each zone would assume importance and in that regard he pointed out to para 5 of the Presidential Order in general and clause 5(1) of the said Order in particular. The learned counsel would contend that the right to claim seniority when a person had been selected on the basis of the merit to the zone to which in fact originally he had been appointed, is an unfettered right and hence these persons can go back to Zone-IV and the so-called allotment order cannot alter their position. He would further contend that if at all the parties who may be affected would be the excess candidates to the cadre strength and inasmuch as these candidates fall within the top of the merit list, they cannot be said to be surplus candidates or in excess of the cadre strength. The learned counsel also had pointed out that these selections are of different years, viz., one is of 1989 and another is of 1991, and hence the writ petitioners belonging to 1991 batch may not have even the locus to question these proceedings by way of these Writ Petitions. The learned counsel ultimately would conclude that insofar as Sub-Inspectors who were promoted are concerned, their promotions should not be disturbed and status quo to be maintained in the event the matters being remitted back to the Tribunal for fresh consideration.

10. Mr.Prakash Reddy, the learned counsel would contend that the submissions made by Mr.Nooti Ram Mohan Rao that there is excess of cadre strength is not correct. The learned counsel also had pointed out to 1989 batch and 1991 batch. In all fairness, the learned counsel would submit that the re-allotment made on 17.7.1989 was never questioned. The contention that it is in excess of the cadre strength is not correct as the revised orders were passed on the representation made by certain Sub-Inspectors. He had also pointed out to the case of Mr.K.Rajendra Prasad-6th respondent in particular and had demonstrated how these events had happened. The learned counsel also had pointed to the orders made in R.P.Nos.4622, 4640 and 9453 of 1989 and would contend that in the facts and circumstances and inasmuch as there is bulging of the cadre strength by virtue of the orders passed in OA.No.6915 of 1994,

these parties cannot be treated on a different footing at all. The learned counsel also had explained the scope and ambit of G.O.Ms.No.288, dated 6.5.1986 and G.O.Ms.No.349, dated 15.12.1997 in this regard.

11. Heard the learned counsel for the parties at length.

12. The impugned order in Writ Petition No.12349 of 2004 had already been specified supra. On a careful reading of the said order it is clear that the Tribunal did not consider the aspect of allotment made, and its order in OA.No.1766 of 1990 and batch and also the proceedings dated 17.7.1989 while deciding O.A.No.6915 of 1994. Apart from this aspect of the matter, it also appears that the Government had not brought to the notice of the Tribunal the historical background of the litigation. No doubt Mr.Nooti Ram Mohan Rao placed strong reliance on the proceedings C.No.C3/7/DRSI/88, dated 19.12.1988 issued by the office of the Deputy Inspector General of Police, Kurnool Range, Kurnool wherein it was specified as follows:

> "You are selected as SI/RSI/Woman SI and allotted to Kurnool zone. You are hereby directed to produce Physical Fitness Certificate issued by Civil Surgeon, and Marriage Declaration in the Office of the Dy.Inspr.Genl.of Police, Kurnool Range, Kurnool on or before 25.12.1988 AN so as to issue appointment orders. The candidate who is selected under Sports quota should produce all Spoprts Certificates also in original. You will have to execute an agreement also on a non-judicial stamp paper worth Rs.15/-. Also bring all Educational Certificates in original".

It is no doubt true that these proceedings, which have been specifically pointed out, show that the Sub-Inspectors were appointed to Kurnool zone. But that is not the end of the litigation. On this ground submissions at length were made that inasmuch as these appointments were made on merit in Kurnool zone and though they came to Hyderabad zone, they have an unfettered right of seniority in Kurnool zone and hence the allotment order dated 17.7.1989 would not come in their way. We are not inclined to go deep into these aspects. The Government also had taken a stand that there are certain irregularities in this regard. It is pertinent to note that the post of Sub-Inspector is a zonal post and the promotions are governed on zonal basis. Hence the zonal system assumes some importance in this regard. In such a situation when it is not a transfer as understood by the Tribunal while making the order in OA.No.6915 of 1994,

impugned in Writ Petition No.12349 of 2004, and when it is an allotment made by virtue of the proceedings dated 17.7.1989, taking all the facets of the litigation into consideration the non-consideration of the proceedings dated 17.7.1989 would assume lot of importance. It is also pertinent to note that this allotment was made on 17.7.1989 whereas the individual orders issued to the aforesaid meritorious candidates are dated 19.12.1988. Apart from this aspect of the matter, subsequent thereto also much water had flown in the light of the order made in O.A.No.1766 of 1990 and batch and R.P.Nos.4622, 4640 and 9453 of 1989. Clause 5(1) of the Presidential Order has a bearing on zonal appointment and date of appointment. The individual orders issued to the meritorious candidates dated 19.12.1988 and the proceedings dated 17.7.1989 no doubt had been elaborated by the counsel representing the respective parties. On appreciation of over all material available on record especially in the light of the stand taken by the Government relating to the non-production of the records and non-furnishing of the historical background of the *lis* commencing from 1988-89 onwards, we are of the considered view that OA.No.6915 of 2004 and MA.No.2098 of 2001 had not been decided by the Tribunal taking into consideration all the relevant aspects inclusive of the allotment order made by proceedings dated 17.7.1989. The Tribunal also had not decided the matter taking all the facets of the *lis* into consideration and hence it is needless to say that the impugned order challenged in Writ Petition No.12349 of 2004 cannot be sustained.

13. As a last ground of attack, delay also was made a ground. It is pertinent to note that the writ petitioners are non-parties to the litigation and they are of 1991 batch and aggrieved by the threat of reversion and impact on the chances of promotions, it became inevitable to the writ petitioners in Writ Petition No.12348 of 2004 referred to supra to approach this Court questioning the order of status quo in OA.Nos. 2925, 2928 and 2929 of 2004 and also the impugned order made in OA.No.6915 of 1994 in Writ Petition No.12349 of 2004. Hence, we are of the opinion that these parties are non-parties to the litigation and in view of the threat of reversion and also in view of the closure of promotion avenues, at appropriate stage they approached this Court by filing the present Writ Petitions. Consequently the ground of attack of delay also will fall into

insignificance.

14. It is needless to say that the impugned orders in both the Writ Petitions cannot be sustained and accordingly they are hereby set aside. The matters are accordingly remanded to the Tribunal for fresh consideration and the Tribunal shall give opportunity to all the affected parties concerned and decide the matters afresh in accordance with law. This exercise shall be completed within a period of two (02) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Pending disposal of the O.A.Nos. 2925, 2928 and 2929 of 2004 and O.A.No.6915 of 1994 by the Tribunal, status quo as obtaining today in respect of the candidates covered by the Writ Petitions shall be maintained.

15. In the result, both the Writ Petitions are allowed to the extent indicated above. No costs.

(G.BIKSHAPATHY, J.)

28th December, 2004.

(P.S.NARAYANA, J.)

SSR

L.R. copy to be marked.

..... REGISTRAR

;

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

To

1 The Director General and Inspector General of Police, Hyderabad.
2 The Secretary, Home Department, Government of Andhra Pradsesh, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
3 The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Kurnool Range, Kurnool.
4 The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Hyderabad Range, Hyderabad.

5 The Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad.

6 The Registrar, A.P. Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad.

7 2 CCs to G.P. for Services-I, High Court of A.P. Hyderabad. (OUT)

8 2 CD copies.